

Handbook:

Section 2.2 – CAFs: states that they are held on file for two years in case an opening occurs.

Is this true? If so, is it a good idea? I think broader consideration needs to be given to how CAFs are managed in general, including:

- How long they are “active”
- How they can be amended (perhaps because someone is interested in serving on a different committee than first identified) – and if that requires filling out a new form, are both “active” or does one supersede the other?
- Why we require them for representatives to a committee as chosen by the home committee, and what a better alternative might be

Section 2.3 – Appointment

We already changed this sentence, but I think one word was mis-transcribed. Where it says: “Selections are based on current composition, qualifications, ... and to attendance record...” it should say “... and on attendance record...”

2.5.4 Annual Classification

This section needs to be re-written to describe and incorporate our current SME policy.

2.8 Other terminations

Final sentence reads “Prompt, written notifications to the committee members will be given in the event of such action.” I think the word “prompt” should be removed, because it directly follows a sentence describing three absences as grounds for termination. Makes it sound like people will promptly be terminated after three absences. If we do mean that, it would be a much more aggressive stance than we have taken so far; and that should be discussed.

2.9 Associate members

Is this still true or relevant? Should it remain?

3.4 Secretary

The duties described in subsection 2 seem to me to be the responsibility of the Chair. I think the subsection could be deleted entirely, and let committees determine such responsibility on their own.

3.6 Staff Assistance

This seems excessive to me. Including it in the handbook makes it seem like a standard practice, when it is clearly not. I think the section should be deleted.

4.4 Executive Session

Is this section updated to include the newly-allowable reason (can't recall what that is) for going in to Exec Session? If not, it should be.

4.7 Posting

In the middle of the paragraph it talks about "... or adjourned meetings if scheduled for less than 48 hours from the adjournment, prior posting is not required;" I have no idea what that means. If it is necessary to include it, perhaps it could be reworded, or revised to include additional explanation.

8.3 Liaison with Staff

Toward the end of the paragraph it says "The Town manager often seeks input from the committee chair prior to the annual review of the liaison's job performance." If this is accurate, it's fine. Otherwise, I suggest changing "often seeks" to "may seek".

Per Diana's edits, handed out at the 8/10 meeting:

#1 – I think it needs broader consideration. #2 – agree. #3 – agree. #4 – agree, except for the possible delete (I think they do need to continue to be filed with the SB office.) #5 – Don't think it is necessary – covered in section 8.3. #6 – agree. #7 – agree, but suggest changing "...must post the meetings..." to "...are expected to post the minutes..." #8 – could go either way. #9 I think it's fine as-is – very general, perhaps because it varies.

Other committee issues I think need to be considered at some point:

Appointments:

- Is it better to fill slots with available volunteers regardless of their strengths and weaknesses, or to leave a vacancy and either wait for or recruit a stronger candidate?
- What would be the best way to express concern about an appointment?
- Should we consider some kind of "best practices" for how to handle appointments, so it doesn't vary with each committee clerk? Might be interesting to know how other communities handle the entire process.
- Should we create new language that allows for broader ability to terminate members for behavior that is disruptive or problematic to the committee? Or should we be stuck with difficult people for the length of their terms, unless they can be terminated for excessive absences?

General:

- Should the SB be giving more direction to committees about expectations and priorities? If so, how best to do that?

Staff time:

- What role might the SB have in addressing the time and workload burdens of staff liaisons? Should we try to eliminate non-vital committees? Should we change the policy as to the role of the liaison and how much committees can expect/ask from them? Other?